



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/870,836	06/06/97	HAMPAPUR	VIRAGE-INTZ

LM02/0719
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR
620 NEWPORT CENTER DRIVE
SIXTENTH FLOOR
NEWPORT BEACH CA 92660-8016

EXAMINER

ART. UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
-----------	--------------

DATE MAILED: 07/19/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Interview Summary

Application No.

08/870,386

Applicant(s)

Hamapapur et al.

Examiner

Anand Rao

Group Art Unit

2713

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Anand Rao

(3) _____

(2) Mr. John Carson (#34,303)

(4) _____

Date of Interview Jul 18, 2000Type: ☐ Telephonic ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☒ applicant's representative).Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.Claim(s) discussed: 1-23 (and soon to be added claim 24)

Identification of prior art discussed:

US Patent 5,767,922 to Zabih et al., (hereinafter referred to as "Zabih").

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The following was discussed. After a further review of the Zabih reference it was determined the claimed method of the instant invention as reviewed in a proposed amendment overcomes the art of record, and would place the application in a favorable consideration for allowance, pending the entry of said amendment in a formal response. It is noted that in particular, the claims of the instant invention stress the operative limitation of "not updating the reference frame while going through a sequence of more than two frames, until the identification of a key frame has been made..." This feature is different from Zabih which constantly updates the reference frame even when identifying scene breaks over more than two frames (Zabih: figure 7).

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

ANDY RAO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

ANAND RAO
PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2713

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

Art Unit: 2713

DETAILED ACTION

Allowable Subject Matter

1. As per the Applicant's instructions filed in Paper 15 on 7/14/00, claim 24 has been added.
2. Claims 1-24 as filed in Paper 15 filed on 7/14/00 are allowed.

Independent claims 1, 8, 18, 23 and 24 recite the novel limitation of identifying a current frame as a key frame if the chromatic (first) difference measure exceeds a (first) chromatic threshold and a (second) structure difference measure exceeds a (second) structural threshold, otherwise selecting a new current frame and repeating the identifying step until a key frame is identified, as in claims 1, 8, 18, 23, and 24, which is not shown nor obvious from the art of record. Dependent claims 2-7, 9-17, 19-22 are allowed for the reasons concerning the independent claims.

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anand S. Rao whose telephone number is (703)-305-4813.

asr

August 17, 2000

ANDY RAO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

